

IS DARK MATTER FUTILE ON THE BRANE? *

LÁSZLÓ Á. GERGELY

*Departments of Theoretical and Experimental Physics, University of Szeged,
Dóm tér 9, H-6720 Szeged, Hungary
gergely@physx.u-szeged.hu*

We investigate whether dark matter can be replaced by various source terms appearing in the effective Einstein equation, valid on a brane embedded into a higher dimensional space-time (the bulk). Such non-conventional source terms include a quadratic (ordinary) matter source term, a geometric source term originating in the Weyl curvature of the bulk, a source term arising from the possible asymmetric embedding, and finally the pull-back to the brane of possible non-standard model bulk fields.

Keywords: brane-worlds, asymmetric embedding, brane-bulk energy exchange

According to modern precision cosmology¹⁻³ our universe is described by a Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker geometry with flat spatial sections. The matter source for this geometry is however less well known. Ordinary, baryonic matter gives a tiny $\approx 3\%$ fraction ρ_b of the critical energy density. In order to explain galactic cluster dynamics and galactic rotation curves, dark matter has been introduced, and it is believed that nowadays there is approximately 10 times as much dark matter as baryonic matter in the universe. Models of cold and warm (but not hot) dark matter are compatible with observations. The remaining $\approx 70\%$ of the critical energy density is given by a mysterious dark energy, a form of matter represented in the simplest way by the famous cosmological constant Λ (a perfect fluid with pressure $p_\Lambda = w\rho_\Lambda$, $w = -1$). Dark energy obeys $\rho_{de} + 3p_{de} < 0$, the condition which (due to the Raychaudhuri equation) yields to an accelerated expansion of the universe. The latter seems unavoidable in the light of the recent distant supernovae surveys.^{4,5} Observations support very well the simplest possible dark energy, the cosmological constant Λ and the basic question is not how different w is from -1 , but instead whether it is allowed to have any dynamics. But even if dark energy would be simply a cosmological constant, what is its origin? The explanation in terms of vacuum energy density turned into one of the biggest problems of modern theoretical physics: the discrepancy is of 120 orders of magnitude.

With so much unknown matter and energy in our universe the question naturally arises, whether gravitational dynamics, as we now it, has to be modified? Dark matter is conveniently replaced by the so-called MOND gravitational theory.^{6,7} This however conflicts with cosmological observations.⁸ The late-time acceleration of the universe can be explained by the inverse curvature gravity theories.⁹

* Research supported by OTKA grants no. T046939, TS044665 and the János Bolyai Fellowships of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. The author wishes to thank the organizers of the 11th Marcel Grossmann Meeting for support.

2 *Gergely*

The theory of gravitation can be also modified by returning to the pioneering ideas of Kaluza and Klein, allowing for more than 4 space-time dimensions. Indeed string / M-theory is multidimensional and in recent years a simpler class of effective models,^{10–12} known as brane-worlds have been intensively studied. In these models the observable universe is a 4-dimensional space-time continuum (the brane with tension λ) on which standard model fields act. Gravitation however is allowed to leak out in a fifth, possibly non-compact dimension. Its 5-dimensional dynamics is governed by the Einstein equation with cosmological constant term.

The apparent gravitational dynamics on our observable 4-dimensional universe appears through a projection formalism. It consist of the twice contracted Gauss equation, the Codazzi equation and an effective Einstein equation.¹³ In the derivation of the latter the junction conditions across the brane are employed. The effective Einstein equation, first derived¹⁴ for symmetric embedding and no bulk sources was later supplemented by the pull-back to the brane of the bulk energy momentum tensor $\tilde{\Pi}_{ab}$:

$$\mathcal{P}_{ab} = \frac{2\tilde{\kappa}^2}{3} \left(g_a^c g_b^d \tilde{\Pi}_{cd} \right)^{TF} \quad (1)$$

(with $\tilde{\kappa}^2$ the bulk coupling constant and g_{ab} the induced metric on the brane) and the asymmetry source term $\bar{L}_{ab}^{TF}$ which is the tracefree part of the tensor

$$\bar{L}_{ab} = \bar{K}_{ab} \bar{K} - \bar{K}_{ac} \bar{K}_b^c - \frac{g_{ab}}{2} \left(\bar{K}^2 - \bar{K}_{ab} \bar{K}^{ab} \right) , \quad (2)$$

(with $\bar{K}_{ab}$ the mean extrinsic curvature). The effective Einstein equation is:¹³

$$G_{ab} = -\Lambda g_{ab} + \kappa^2 T_{ab} + \tilde{\kappa}^4 S_{ab} - \bar{\mathcal{E}}_{ab} + \bar{L}_{ab}^{TF} + \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{ab} . \quad (3)$$

(with κ^2 the brane coupling constant). The function $\Lambda = (\tilde{\kappa}^2/2) (\lambda - n^c n^d \tilde{\Pi}_{cd} - \bar{L}/4)$ possibly varies due to both the normal projection of the bulk energy-momentum tensor and the embedding. When constant, Λ represents the the brane cosmological constant. The source term S_{ab} is quadratic in the brane energy-momentum tensor T_{ab} , and it modifies early cosmology.¹⁵ The quantity

$$\mathcal{E}_{ac} = \tilde{C}_{abcd} n^b n^d$$

represents the electric part of the bulk Weyl tensor $\tilde{C}_{abcd}$. In a cosmological context $\mathcal{E}_{ab}$ is known as dark radiation.

Modified gravitational dynamics leads therefore to four new source terms in the effective Einstein equation. In what follows we discuss the potential of generating / replacing dark matter, represented by these source terms.

From this point of view the less interesting of them is the non-linear source term S_{ab} . This is because it scales as ρ/λ , as compared to the energy-momentum tensor and this ratio is infinitesimal, excepting the very early universe, due to the huge value $\lambda > 138.59 \text{ TeV}^4$ of the brane tension.¹⁶

The Weyl curvature of the bulk on the other hand can generate quite remarkable electric part contributions $\mathcal{E}_{ab}$. In a spherically symmetric brane-world metric the

Schwarzschild mass parameter receives a new contribution due to $\mathcal{E}_{ab}$ which is interpreted as the mass of dark matter.¹⁷ When the cosmological constant is neglected, the dark mass scales linearly with the radial distance, explaining the flatness of the galactic rotation curves. The bending angle of light in such brane world models was found much larger as compared to the predictions of the dark matter models, the deviation increasing with the degree of compactness. This is however exactly the regime where no observational data on gravitational lensing is available yet.

Properly chosen non-standard model bulk fields can replace dark matter in explaining structure formation,¹⁸ as the evolution of perturbations on the brane becomes similar to that of the Cold Dark Matter (CDM) model.

Most interestingly, the combined effect of asymmetry and a bulk radiation qualitatively can give both dark matter and dark energy.^{16,19} This has been investigated in a closed brane-world universe model, with bulk black hole only on one side of the brane. In this model the emitted Hawking radiation is partially absorbed on the brane and partially transmitted through, but other models with radiation in the bulk have been also considered.²⁰ In principle in such models there are two competing effects: (a) the radiation pressure accelerates the brane, manifesting itself as dark energy, and (b) the absorbed radiation increases the energy density of the bulk, appearing as CDM. These two effects compete with each other, and with properly chosen initial data a critical-like behavior was observed.^{16,19} Based on the predictions of these toy models, it seems worth to work out more realistic brane-world models in order to confront them with observations.

References

1. A. Doroshkevich, D. L. Tucker., S. Allam, and M. J. Way, *Astron. Astrophys.* **418**, 7 (2004).
2. M. Tegmark, M.A. Strauss, M.R. Blanton, et al., *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 103501 (2004).
3. D. N. Spergel, R. Bean, O. Doré, et al., *astro-ph/0603449* (2006).
4. A. G. Ries, L-G. Strolger, J. Tonry, et al, *Astrophys. J.* **607**, 665 (2005).
5. P. Astier, J. Guy, J. N. Regnault, et al., *Astron. Astrophys.* **447**, 31 (2006).
6. M. Milgrom, *Astrophys. J.* **270**, 365 (1983), *ibid.* 371 (1983), *ibid.* 384 (1983).
7. P. D. Mannheim, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **56**, 340 (2006).
8. A. Slosar, A. Melchiorri, and J. Silk, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 101301 (2005).
9. O. Mena, J. Santiago, and J. Weller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 041103 (2006).
10. L. Randall and R. Sundrum, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 3370 (1999).
11. L. Randall and R. Sundrum, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 4690 (1999).
12. R. Maartens R, *Living Rev. Rel.* **7**, 1 (2004).
13. L. Á. Gergely, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 124011 (2003).
14. T. Shiromizu T, K. Maeda, and M. Sasaki, *Phys. Rev. D* **62**, 024012 (2000).
15. P. Binétruy, C. Deffayet, U. Ellwanger, and D. Langlois, *Phys.Lett. B* **477**, 285 (2000).
16. L. Á. Gergely and Z. Keresztes, *JCAP* **06**(01), 022 (2006).
17. T. Harko and L. S. Cheng, *Astrophys. J.* **636**, 8 (2006).
18. S. Pal, *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 024005 (2006).
19. Z. Keresztes, I. Képiró, and L. Á. Gergely, *JCAP* **06**(05), 020 (2006).
20. D. Jennings, I. R. Vernon, A.-C. Davis, and C. van de Bruck, *JCAP* **05**(04) 013 (2005).